

2834



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:
C. W. Luttrell et al.

Serial No.: 09/967,144

Filed: September 28, 2001

For: ELECTRIC MOTOR STATOR AND
MOTOR INCORPORATING SAME

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 2834

Examiner: Cuevas, Pedro J.

Atty. Docket: 01RE070/YOD
REEL:0022

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date below:	
July 21, 2003 Date	 Lynda Howell

**RESPONSE TO
OFFICE ACTION MAILED MAY 21, 2003**

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 21, 2003. In the Office Action, all of pending claims 1-31 were rejected. The rejections and the prior art cited by the Examiner have been carefully considered and all of the pending claims are believed to be clearly patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested.

First, the Examiner indicated that the title of the invention was not considered to be descriptive. The Examiner suggested a much more specific title.

Applicants believe that the title of the invention adequately reflects the scope of the subject matter for which protection is sought. Specifically, 37 C.F.R. 1.72 provides that the title should be "as short and specific as possible." The title, of course, should be commensurate with the scope of the claims. In the present case, however, the claimed

invention is certainly not in any way limited to a 72 slot stator. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that any appropriate change in the title be held in abeyance pending the determination of allowable subject matter in the present application.

Claims 1-25 and 29 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,127,787 to Auinger. This rejection, then, includes rejections of independent claims 1, 11, 19, 20 and 29. The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious in view of Auinger and Dittman. This rejection, then, relates to the remaining independent claims 26, 30 and 31.

The Examiner indicated that the Auinger reference was believed to teach the subject matter of the independent claims noted above, including the subject matter of claims 1, 11, 19, 20 and 29. The reference has been carefully studied. However, no teaching whatsoever can be found in the reference for coil groups that have leads exiting a stator core at different ends thereof. As described in the present application, the use of concentric winding patterns is particularly attractive due to the ability to more easily install windings within stators. However, conventional motor designs do not call for concentric coil groups that have leads exiting from different ends of the stator core.

Many of the present claims, including independent claims 1, 20, 26 and 30, require coil groups that exit opposite ends of a stator core. The Auinger reference does not disclose coils or coil groups that exit opposite ends of a stator core. Indeed, through a detailed analysis of the entire disclosure of Auinger, no reference can be found to ends of the stator core at all or to preferred or even proposed physical installation of coils within a stator core so as to exit opposite ends thereof. Accordingly, the Auinger reference simply cannot anticipate at least independent claims 1, 20, 26 and 30, as well as any claims depending from these claims, on this basis alone. Applicants also note that the Dittman reference does nothing to obviate the deficiencies of Auinger as regards the physical

implementation and installation of the coils or coil groups, and whether they should exit one end of the stator core or the other.

The additional independent claims currently pending relate to specific orders of coil groups in a stator. This is the case of independent claims 11, 19, 29 and 31. Applicants can find no support whatsoever in either Auinger or Dittman for the particular coil group ordering specified in those claims. The Examiner is respectfully reminded that it is the Examiner's duty to specifically cite prior art which supports the rejection. After a very careful review of Auinger and Dittman, no specific support whatsoever can be found for the ordering recited in the claims mentioned. Accordingly, Applicants can only conclude that these claims, and claims depending therefrom, are clearly patentable over the cited references.

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 21, 2003

79
Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS
ALLEN-BRADLEY COMPANY, LLC
Patent Department/704P Floor 8 T-29
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53204
Attention: Mr. Alexander Gerasimow
Phone: (414) 382-2000